

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-11, 13 and 15-22 are pending in the present Application. Claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 are allowed, Claims 2, 6, 7, 8, 13 and 17-19 have been amended, leaving Claims 2, 4-11, 13 and 15-22 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Claims 8 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form, and as such are allowable.

Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, 17 and 18 have been amended to more clearly define Applicants' claimed invention. Support for this amendment can at least be found in the specification at page 10, lines 20-21.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Amendment filed on January 5, 2005

The Examiner requested that Applicants resubmit the amendment filed on January 5, 2005, since the amendment contains some character font with very poor reading.

In response to the Examiner's request, the amendment filed on January 5, 2005 is attached hereto as an appendix.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 8-11 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 8 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 19 are allowable. Moreover, as dependent claims from independent Claim 8, Claims 9-11 are, by definition, also allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 7, 18 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (EP 0574920).

This rejection is moot in light of Applicants' claim amendments.

Claims 7, 18 and 21-22 are directed to an active matrix type display device comprising, *inter alia*, the following element: "said gate selection signal requires at least a time $t/2$ and

shorter than t to fall, where t is the time from when a first gate line assumes an unselected state to when subsequent second gate line assumed a selected state.”

Absent in Suzuki et al. is any teaching that the gate selection signal requires at least a time $t/2$ and shorter than t to fall. Since Suzuki et al. fails to teach at least one claimed element, Claims 7, 18 and 21-22 are not anticipated and are therefore allowable.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (EP 0574920) in view of Deane (US 5,929,489).

Claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,421,038) in view of Yanagi et al. (US 6,359,607).

These rejections are moot in light of Applicants’ claim amendments.

Claims 2, 6, 13, 17 and 20 are direct to an active matrix type display device comprising, *inter alia*, the following element: “said gate selection signal requires at least a time $t/2$ and shorter than t to fall, where t is the time from when a first gate line assumes an unselected state to when subsequent second gate line assumed a selected state.”

Yanagi only shows that a gate selection signal has a time t to fall and does not teach or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention.


Further, none of the above cited references either alone or in combination teach or suggest that the gate selection signal requires a least a time $t/2$ and shorter than t to fall. Since the above cited references fail to teach or suggest at least one claimed element, Claims 2, 6, 13, 17 and 20 are not obvious and are therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 
Joel T. Charlton
Registration No. 52,721

Date: December 8, 2005
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (404) 607-9991
Facsimile (404) 607-9981
Customer No.: 23413

Appendix

Attached hereto as an appendix is the amendment that was filed on January 5, 2005.